

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached sheet(s) of drawings includes the original Figures 1-3 and 5-9 as filed on February 22, 2002 with the parent application, no changes have been made to these figures.

Attachment:        8 Replacement sheets - Figures 1-3 and 5-9

**REMARKS**

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-32 and 51 are pending in the present application. By virtue of this response, claims 1, 21, 32 and 51 have been amended, and no new claims have been added. Accordingly, claims 1, 3-6, 8-32 and 51 are currently under consideration. Amendment and cancellation of certain claims is not to be construed as a dedication to the public of any of the subject matter of the claims as previously presented.

The amendments to claims 1, 32, and 51 are supported at least by page 12, line 2 to page 16, line 19. Claim 21 is amended to fix the antecedent basis. No new matter has been added. In view of the preceding amendments and the remarks made herein, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance.

**Drawings:**

The drawings have been objected to because of the partial views in Figures 1-3 and 5-9.

In response, Applicants suspect the Examiner may have looked at the wrong figures or the Examiner's file has been "corrupted". Applicants have this suspicion because Applicants have not amended these figures since the parent application was filed on February 22, 2002, and the Examiner has been relying on these figures in issuing three previous Office Actions. For the convenience of the Examiner, copies of the original Figures 1-3 and 5-9 as filed on February 22, 2002 are attached. Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the objection to the drawings.

**35 U.S.C. § 112, First Paragraph**

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-32, and 51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph as allegedly containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

In response, Applicants submit that a person skill in the art would readily appreciate the meaning of *categories* when the term is read in light of the claims, specification, and the figures as a whole. For example, Figures 1-3 and Figures 5-9 illustrate the many categories discussed in different embodiments of the present invention. Specifically, reading pages 13 lines 18-23 and page 21 lines 4-7, where the Examiner indicates the description may be allegedly unclear, a person skill in the art would understand that Explicit is one of the categories. Applicants have used the term “Explicit category” in the lines leading to the description at pages 13 lines 18-23 and page 21 lines 4-7. In addition, Applicants submit that a person skill in the art would understand the term “such as” in pages 13 lines 18-23 and page 21 lines 4-7 to mean “which may be appeared in information related to”, when the phrase “such as” is read in light of the specification and figures. Applicants have amended the specification to clarify this point. Thus, for the reasons presented above and the amendment to the specification, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw this written description rejection.

### **35 U.S.C. § 103(a)**

Claims 1, 3-6, 8-32 and 51 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over U.S. patent no. 5,933,827 to Cole et al. Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Applicants respectfully submit that the Cole reference does not teach or suggest the element of “a plurality of categories based on the copyright status of material on a page” of the present application, which has been a claim limitation since the September 8, 2005 amendment. In the current Office Action, the Examiner admits that Cole et al. “does not explicitly teach that the categories are categories based on the copyright status of materials on a page. However, Cole et al. does teach a cataloging function and profile building function that allows users to define a subject category [cite omitted]. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill at the time of the invention to have implemented a copyright status category since Cole et al. allows for the creation of categories such as business type categories and subcategories through a cataloging function and profile building function. A copy right status category would allow [uses] user to link to business

material such as intellectual property.” (see page 6, January 9, 2006 Office Action, emphasis added)

Applicants respectfully disagree. First, Applicants submit that the Examiner’s response lacks support. It appears that the Examiner has taken the position as a person skill in the field of web page classification and categorization at the time of the invention (priority date May 4, 1999). As the Examiner has indicated in the Office Action, the Cole reference does not teach or suggest the claimed element of creating categories based on the copyright status of material on a page. The obviousness rejection is based on the Examiner’s own knowledge, which the Examiner has not provided any intrinsic or extrinsic evidence to support this knowledge. Merely describing the ability to create various categories does not render the element of creating categories based on the copyright status of material on a page obvious (see page 7, January 9, 2006 Office Action). This claim limitation is not only about having a copyright category; it is also about creating categories based on the copyright status of material on a page. Thus, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not provided the basis that this claim element is obvious as the Cole references never mention any method of cataloging using the copyright status of material on a page. In addition, since there is no basis that this claim element is obvious, there would be no teaching or suggestion of the motivation to combine this claim element with the Cole reference.

Second, the Cole reference does not teach or suggest “business material such as intellectual property.” If an overly broad business category is sufficient to include intellectual property, even though the Cole reference has not offered any disclosure about this, then this argument would extend to cover the business category includes the law category, (since intellectual property is commonly regarded as a category of law). This is contrary to common understanding that the business category does not include the law category, because it is also a common understanding that a business school does not include a law school, even though business and law are closely related.

To expedite the allowance of the pending application, Applicants have further amended claims 1, 32, and 51. Specifically, claim 1, 32, and 51 have been amended to include the element of

“providing a categorization label for the network page using the copyright status of material on the network page; and controlling usage of the network page using the categorization label and the copyright status of the network page”. Applicants submit that the Cole reference does not teach or suggest these two claim limitations in its cataloging function. Therefore, with these amendments to the independent claims 1, 32, and 51, the rejection based on the Cole reference is moot.

In view of the above, Applicants have shown that the Cole reference does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of the pending application. Each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the outstanding rejection of the claims and to pass this application to issue. If it is determined that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below:

In the event the U.S. Patent and Trademark office determines that an extension and/or other relief is required, applicant petitions for any required relief including extensions of time and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to **Deposit Account No. 03-1952** referencing docket no. 588582000120. However, the Commissioner is not authorized to charge the cost of the issue fee to the Deposit Account.

Dated: April 10, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Thomas Chan

Registration No.: 51,543  
MORRISON & FOERSTER LLP  
755 Page Mill Road  
Palo Alto, California 94304-1018  
(650) 813-5616

Attachments